

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,881	11/21/2003	Paul Matthijs	920522-95146	2916
23544 7550 04/03/2009 BARNES & THORNBURG LLP			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 2786			SHERMAN, STEPHEN G	
CHICAGO, IL 60690-2786			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	
				ı
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/03/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Patent-ch@btlaw.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/719,881	MATTHIJS ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
STEPHEN G. SHERMAN	2629	
	10/719,881 Examiner	10/719,881 MATTHIJS ET AL. Examiner Art Unit

	STEPHEN G. SHERMAN	2629						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 24 March 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	hich places the (3) a Request					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as					
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp.	liance with 37 CER 41 37 must be t	iled within two month	of the date of					
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>								
 ∑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) ∑ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ∑ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); 								
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c		cted claims.						
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1								
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):								
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the					
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving. 		be entered and an e	xplanation of					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected:								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu	t before or on the date of filing a No	stice of Anneal will no	he entered					
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		condition for allowan	ce because:					
12 Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)								
13. Other:								
/Amr Awad/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629								

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Claim 16, for example, has been amended to now recite "in a copy of said image, adapting the image content of the pixels corresponding to said the defective cells or of the pixels corresponding to the cells in the neighborhood of the defective cells so, as to emphasize or warm for the presence of pixels corresponding to said defective cells, thereby avoiding misinterpretation of the image displayed on the matrix display device due to said defective cells" which would require further consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: On pages 6-11 of the response the applicant argues the rejections using Aida and Ohara et al. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPO 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPO 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).